



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,940	08/17/2000	Ian MacMillan Ward	604-559	5104

7590 01/30/2003

Nixon & Vanderhye PC  
8th Floor  
1100 North Glebe Road  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

PRATT, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/639,940

Examiner

Christopher C Pratt

Applicant(s)

WARD ET AL.

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 62-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 62-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendments and accompanying remarks filed 11/18/02 have been entered and carefully considered. Applicant's amendment is not found to patentably distinguish the claims over the prior art and Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive of patentability for reasons set forth herein below.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 62-92 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6017834 in view of Bonfield et al and Turner (4662887). Applicant has amended the claims to include the limitation that the fibers are less than 1mm. Applicant argues that Ward does not teach a fiber length of under 1mm. Ward, however, teaches the use of "chopped fibers." Chopped fibers imply short fibers and may inherently refer to fibers having a length under 1mm. Turner teaches the use of a polymeric device comprising fibers used in prosthetic devices. Turner teaches said fibers to be composed of multiple materials including organic polymers (col. 3, lines 50-54). Turner further teaches that the selection of fiber size is well known in the art (col. 3, lines 40-45). Turner specifically teaches the use of fibers having a length under 1mm (example 2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 62-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al (6017834) in view of Bonfield et al (5017627) and Turner et al (4662887).

Applicant argues that the combination of Ward and Bonfield does not teach fibers having a length under 1mm. Turner teaches the use of fibers under 1mm (example 2). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to utilize the fibers of Ward having a length under 1mm, such as .5mm. Such a modification would have been motivated by the desire to increase the density and stiffness of Wards composite material.

Applicant argues that Bonfield “essentially completely melts all of the polyolefin material.” This argument is not persuasive because Bonfield is only relied upon to teach a particular filler.

Applicant argues that the skilled artisan would not have been motivated to utilize fibers under 1mm. The examiner again notes that “chopped fibers” would be understood by the skilled artisan to include fibers under 1mm. The skilled artisan would find it obvious that short fibers allow more fibers to be packed into a closed space. This increases the density of the product thereby increasing its strength.

Applicant argues that the “discovery of the present invention is that the very short length of chopped fiber (max. dimension 1mm),” gives the product unique properties. However, in the previous sentence applicant states that exemplary fiber length is 3.2-3.8mm. The specification lacks a teaching to criticality of less than 1mm. This is not

Art Unit: 1771

technically new matter, but criticality of new limit cannot be shown with respect to the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Pratt whose telephone number is 703-305-6559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7 am to 4 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 1771

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Christopher C. Pratt  
January 27, 2003



CHERYL A. JUSKA  
PRINCIPAL EXAMINER